

REMARKS

By the foregoing amendment, Applicant has rewritten claim 4 into independent form incorporating all of the limitations of the claim from which it depends. Accordingly, the foregoing amendment does not raise the issue of new matter or new issues as claim 4 is now in the same form as it was before the amendment.

The only rejection set forth against claim 4 is found in the final rejection at page 6, paragraph 6, wherein claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pamplin (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0060251) in view of Kornfalt et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,517,935). Although the Examiner alleges that Pamplin discloses at least one decorative face comprising a printed décor paper (page 2, paragraph 31) and acknowledges that Pamplin does not disclose that the paper is covered with an overlay of α -cellulose there are further deficiencies in Pamplin than that acknowledged by the Examiner.

For example, the claimed invention requires that the reversible molding "comprise a core" and that "said core having a plurality of decorative faces affixed to said core wherein at least one of the decorative faces comprises a printed décor paper and an overlay of α -cellulose."

Pamplin even in combination with Kornfalt et al does not teach nor make obvious such claimed invention.

Pamplin teaches that a wallpaper 27 or fabric is typically applied to face 28 of mounting strip 26 e.g. see page 2, paragraph 0032 and fig. 3. Alternatively the mounting strip may be provided with a suitable decorative pattern directly printed thereon also see paragraph 0032. However, there is no disclosure of a plurality of decorative faces affixed

to the core or an at least two of the face differ in at least one property consisting of texture, design, pattern and color and wearing at least one of the decorative face comprises a printed décor paper in an overlay of α -cellulose. Although the Examiner points to the disclosure of Kornfalt with the overlay of α -cellulose, Kornfalt also does not teach a plurality of decorative faces affixed to the core wherein at least two of the faces differ and at least one property selected from the group consisting of texture, design, pattern and color and thus the proposed combination of Pamplin and Kornfalt still lacks the basic teaching of the structure of the reversible molding of the claimed invention. For the foregoing reasons Applicants respectfully submit that the previous rejection of claim 4 over the combination of Pamplin in view of Kornfalt fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, which is still the case here. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 4 is patentable over the proposed combination of references as is all claims which are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 4. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Consideration of the previous rejection of claims 20, 27 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pamplin is respectfully requested.

With regard to the Examiner's rejection of claim 20, the Examiner argues that "Pamplin discloses a method of "inherently" reducing molding inventories...". However, the rejection of claim 20 is not under 35 U.S.C. §102 but rather under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The concepts of "inherency" and "obviousness" are completely different concepts.

By making a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) the issue here is whether the claimed method of reducing molding inventories would have been obvious to the ordinary worker skilled in the art at the time the invention was made. As the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals stated in *re Shetty* 195 USPQ 753, 756 (1977): [inherency] is quite immaterial if, as the record establishes here, one of ordinary skill in the art would not

appreciate or recognize that inherent result. The Examiner has not pointed to any specific teachings in the cited prior art that would show a decorative face affixed to a core such that rotation of the core will expose at least one of the decorative faces wherein at least two of the faces differ in at least one property selected from the group consisting of texture, design, pattern, color and shape and each of the faces independently comprise at least one selected from the group consisting of foil, laminate, veneer and clear protective material. Because the Examiner has not even shown the basic structure of the molding, it is not "inherent" that the product of Pamplin would in any way "inherently" reduce molding inventories. According to Pamplin page 2, paragraph 0032, a pattern wallpaper 27 or fabric is applied to face 28 of mounting strip 26 to produce a pattern strip 34. As a result, "numerous commercially available wallpaper patterns or fabric may advantageously be selected from" which shows that Pamplin still intends to provide, as alternatives, numerous commercially available wallpaper patterns or fabrics. It is not inherent i.e. not inevitable by using the disclosure of Pamplin that the molding inventories would be reduced in any manner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness and withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Reconsideration of the previous rejection of claims 14-16, 20-24, 26, 28 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ford (GB 2,096,658) in view of Pamplin is respectfully requested. Although the Examiner again argues that Ford discloses a reversible molding (5) have a plurality of faces (citing the abstract) wherein at least two of the said faces differ in shape (citing the abstract; Figs. 2, 4), Ford does not disclose a plurality of faces that differ in shape. Rather, if one appreciates what Ford is teaching, the embodiment of Fig. 4 is merely an inversion of the tile orientation from Fig. 2 and not the provision of a plurality of reversible faces as suggested by the Examiner. This is clearly

described by the author in the specification at page 2, lines 64-70, as a simple "inversion" of the tile, and not reversal of the tile or providing a plurality of molding faces.

This is apparently acknowledged by the Examiner in the sentence "Ford does not disclose that the faces are affixed to a core and also a different and at least one additional property consisting of texture, design, pattern and color and each of the faces independently comprise foil, paint, clear protective material, stain, laminate or veneer" as stated in paragraph (a) on page 9 of the Office Action. While the Examiner alleges that it is "notoriously well known in the art...", Applicants respectfully dispute this allegation and is clearly not shown in the Pamplin teachings the deficiencies which have been noted above. While the Examiner in the final rejection argues that "Pamplin teaches a reversible molding (26) having a plurality of decorative faces (34) affixed to a core such is not supported by the Pamplin teachings. As noted in paragraph 0032 on page 2 of Pamplin mounting strip 26 has applied to a face 28 thereof a patterned wallpaper 27 or fabric to produce a pattern strip 34 where Pamplin still fails to teach the expressed limitations of the claims that "at least two of the faces is different in texture, design, pattern and color..." as specifically recited by Applicants claims. Accordingly Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed combination of Ford and Pamplin still fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness with a claimed limitation. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection and passing the application to issue are respectfully requested.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Deposit Account No. 14-1437, under Order No. 8688.024.US0000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Thomas P. Pavelko/

TPP/tmj

Thomas P. Pavelko
Registration No. 31,689
NOVAK DRUCE & QUIGG LLP
1300 Eye Street, NW
1000 West Tower
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 659-0100
Facsimile: (202) 659-0105

Date: June 26, 2008